

Pete j he
wants one.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Notes on DD/NFAC Thoughts

FROM:

Deputy Director for Policy,
Analysis and Evaluation
1006 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

120 APR 1991

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. EA/D/PPPM
5E58 Hqs.

2.

3.

DD/PPPM

4.

5.

D/PPPM

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

You requested ideas before meeting Ev Hineman on "some thoughts on Revising Agency Policies and Procedures."

These along with his submission are attached.

STAT

NOTES ON DD/NFAC THOUGHTS

1. Retain a small, high-powered personnel policy staff in the O/DCI. Return the rest of OPPPM to the DDA.

Note: There are four problems with creating a personnel policy staff in the O/DCI. First, there could possibly be some confusion over who is responsible for providing guidance on personnel procedures and practices, i.e., the DCI or the DDA unit. Second, there could also be confusion over the working relationships between the DCI and the DDA units. Third, there would be two individuals within the Agency primarily responsible for personnel administration. Fourth, physical separation from the day-to-day working problems of the personnel system may lead to the isolation of the DCI unit and might result in an "Ivory Tower" approach to personnel management.

2. Eliminate the "potential" section of the PAR.

Note: Elimination of the "potential" section of the PAR is being addressed in the PAR Evaluation Survey which should be completed in the next four weeks.

3. Retain the semi-annual uniform promotion schedule, but allow the Deputy Directors to make out-of-cycle exceptions in cases where they are clearly warranted.

Note: In order to insure equity across the Agency, out-of-cycle promotions should be approved centrally.

4. With regard to comparative evaluation, eliminate the requirement for GS-06 and below. Also cancel the order that forced all directorates to include certain common specific factors.

Note: The comparative evaluation process including the use of common promotion factors is presently being evaluated. It is expected that this evaluation will be completed in June or July, and these two items can be better addressed at that time.

5. Restore the Scientific Pay Scale as separate and distinct from the SIS.

Note: The pay scale within CIA is presently being studied. At the request of the PMAB, OPPPM is studying a special pay scale for CIA, which would preclude the need for a separate SPS pay scale.

6. Eliminate the Annual Personnel Plan, or reduce it to only those items in which the EXCOM and DCI really want to be involved.

7. Make parallel changes in the Annual Personnel Report. Do away with promotion goals.

Notes 6 & 7: The DDCI has eliminated the APP and APR and has requested OPPPM and the Executive Committee Staff to develop a new process for planning and monitoring the achievement of his personnel objectives. The DDCI indicated that he expects senior management involvement in the development of this process.

8. Eliminate or drastically reduce rules that tie PAR scores to various bonuses and awards and that use ranking categories as qualifications for various training courses. If the link between the PAR score and the QSI cannot be eliminated, it should be reduced to a PAR score of 5 rather than 6. The current requirement serves to inflate PAR scores.

Note: The prime consideration in discussing the link between a QSI recommendation and the performance level on the PAR is the intent of Congress. That is, performance that substantially exceeds the requirements of the position in order to justify more rapid pay advancement. To date this year, four percent of the Agency population has been awarded a QSI; the remainder of the Federal Government is striving for a three percent record. It does not appear that the performance level of 6 on the PAR has inhibited the awarding of QSI's to deserving employees.

9. Eliminate the need for OPPPM approval of "in-grade" hires--that is, hiring at any step other than step 1 of the grade. Leave the monitoring of this to the directorates. (In NFAC, we would eliminate the formal request for approval entirely. NFAC/PMES routinely reviews the proposed grade and step when the request for a hiring action comes through, and can monitor what is going on on behalf of D/NFAC without a specific additional piece of paper.)

Note: Again, in order to insure equity across the Agency, "in-grade" hires should be approved centrally.

10. Redistribute the authority for managing position grade allocations to give the directorates more power and PMCD less. Specifically, we would make the PMCD recommendations advisory to the Deputy Director concerned, giving him the authority to decide and leaving it to PMCD to appeal to higher authority if they disagree. This would make PMCD advisory to the people who are charged to make management choices. It would prevent micromanagement from outside the line.

Note: Central control of grade allocations is another means of insuring equity across the Agency. Central control of this program is essential particularly where internal comparisons are used in grade determinations. Inequities would abound with five sets of criteria. The Foreign Service tried this, and are now at work trying to re-establish commonality and equity between the Bureaus.

11. Remove the requirement for service in a rotational assignment as a criterion for selection to the SIS. On this point and the others above, flexibility in the system is more desirable than rigid application of "rules." Rules should become "guidance" in most cases.

Note: Rotational assignments are not a requirement for selection for promotion to SIS. To date, they have been one of a number of factors used in the decision process. The lack of a rotational assignment has not prevented a qualified and deserving individual from being promoted to the SIS level.

12. Restore slots in the Armed Forces Staff College.

13. Restore the slot at the Imperial Defense College.

14. Eliminate the requirement that officers be in supervisory positions before they can be sent for supervisory training. NEAC would rather train prospective managers before they begin to supervise and make mistakes that become bad habits. Find ways to test for managerial aptitude, and provide training to likely candidates.

15. Re-examine the OCDP. The NEAC AOP seems to us to have been more effective.

16. Restore clerical training in OTE.

Notes 12 through 16: These comments should be addressed to the Director of Training and Education, and the Training Selection Board. However, I personally support the concept of training potential supervisors targeted for supervisor jobs before, rather than after they get the job, as this may enhance the caliber of CIA supervisors.

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP		Date
TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)		Initials Date
1. <i>DD PA/E</i>	<i>11A 15R 1981</i>	<i>B</i> <i>/</i>
2. <i>Henry - let's discuss</i>		
3.		
4.		
5.		
Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Pete,
I will need some
of your ideas before
meeting with Ev.

Harry

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Room No.—Bldg.

Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)

Prescribed by GSA
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

* GPO : 1980 C - 311-156 (17)

NFAC 2095/81

NATIONAL FOREIGN ASSESSMENT CENTER

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505

13 APR 1981

NOTE FOR: D/OPPPM

SUBJECT: Some Thoughts on Revising Agency
Policies and Procedures

Shortly after Mr. Casey was appointed, Bruce invited the NFAC Office Directors and Staff Chiefs to suggest desirable changes in Agency policies and procedures. We have had several conversations about this, and the attached list reflects our feelings about possible changes in the areas of personnel and training. We would be interested in your view about these suggestions, and would like to consider any additional ideas that you may have.

Should we get together to discuss this list and your own proposed changes?

[Redacted Signature Box]

R. E. Hineman
Deputy Director

Attachment

STAT

THOUGHTS ON REVISING AGENCY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Personnel

- Retain a small, high-powered personnel policy staff in the O/DCI. Return the rest of OPPPM to the DDA.
- Eliminate the "potential" section of the PAR.
- Retain the semi-annual uniform promotion schedule, but allow the Deputy Directors to make out-of-cycle exceptions in cases where they are clearly warranted.
- With regard to comparative evaluation, eliminate the requirement for GS-06 and below. Also cancel the order that forced all directorates to include certain common specific factors.
- Restore the Scientific Pay Scale as separate and distinct from the SIS.
- Eliminate the Annual Personnel Plan, or reduce it to only those items in which the EXCOM and DCI really want to be involved.
- Make parallel changes in the Annual Personnel Report. Do away with promotion goals.
- Eliminate or drastically reduce rules that tie PAR scores to various bonuses and awards and that use ranking categories as qualifications for various training courses. If the link between the PAR score and the QSI cannot be eliminated, it should be reduced to a PAR score of 5 rather than 6. The current requirement serves to inflate PAR scores.
- Eliminate the need for OPPPM approval of "in-grade" hires--that is, hiring at any step other than step 1 of the grade. Leave the monitoring of this to the directorates. (In NFAC, we would eliminate the formal request for approval entirely. NFAC/PMES routinely reviews the proposed grade and step when the request for a hiring action comes through, and can monitor what is going on on behalf of D/NFAC without a specific additional piece of paper.)
- Redistribute the authority for managing position grade allocations to give the directorates more power and PMCD less. Specifically, we would make the PMCD recommendations advisory to the Deputy Director concerned, giving him the authority to decide and leaving it to PMCD to appeal to higher authority if they disagree. This would make PMCD advisory to the people who are charged to make management choices. It would prevent micromanagement from outside the line.

- Remove the requirement for service in a rotational assignment as a criterion for selection to the SIS. On this point and the others above, flexibility in the system is more desirable than rigid application of "rules." Rules should become "guidance" in most cases.

Training

- Restore slots in the Armed Forces Staff College.
- Restore the slot at the Imperial Defense College.
- Eliminate the requirement that officers be in supervisory positions before they can be sent for supervisory training. NFAC would rather train prospective managers before they begin to supervise and make mistakes that become bad habits. Find ways to test for managerial aptitude, and provide training to likely candidates.
- Re-examine the OCDP. The NFAC AOP seems to us to have been more effective.
- Restore clerical training in OTE.